

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

2  
3  
4

## 6

7
8

9  
10

12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22

23

1        **§ 102 Rejections**

2        Claims 1-6, 23-28 and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as  
3        allegedly being anticipated by Simpson (Mastering Wordperfect® 5.1 & 5.2 For  
4        Windows™, 1993).

5  
6        **The Claims**

7        **Claim 1** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-  
8        readable instructions thereon which, when executed, implement, in an extensible  
9        electronic document editor, *a selection services component* comprising *a selection*  
10       *services interface* that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension  
11       to override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor and  
12       provide a customized model for the selection function, and to clear, add or remove  
13       a segment from a selection object using the customized model for the selection  
14       function. **(emphasis added).**

15       In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that claim 1 is  
16       anticipated by Simpson. The Applicant disagrees.

17       Specifically, the Office alleges that Simpson discloses a selection services  
18       component citing to (pages 512, 514, and 517-518) of Simpson for support. To  
19       assist the Office in appreciating an exemplary selection services component as  
20       contemplated in this claim, the Office is respectfully referred to the Application  
21       (page 27) reproduced below.

22  
23       Selection services provides extensions a way to modify a selection  
24       process of an extensible editor to which the designers are coupled...  
25       interfaces exposed by a selection services component [to] allow extensions  
     to properly communicate with an extensible editor to utilize the selection  
     services component.

1  
2 Simpson, on the other hand, discloses a process for creating a macro,  
3 describing a macro, replacing a macro and running a macro. Simpson's macro is  
4 simply not the same as, nor is it equivalent to Applicant's recited selection  
5 services component. Simpson neither discloses nor suggests a selection services  
6 component as recited in this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim  
7 is allowable.  
8

9 Further, the Office alleges that Simpson discloses a selection services  
10 interface that provides...a customized model for the selection function, citing to  
11 (pages 517-518 and 520) of Simpson for support. Because Simpson does not  
12 disclose or suggest a selection services component as indicated above, it is  
13 virtually impossible for Simpson to disclose or suggest a selection services  
14 interface that provides...a customized model for the selection function as recited  
15 in this claim. To assist the Office in appreciating an exemplary selection services  
16 interface as contemplated in this claim, the Office is respectfully referred to the  
17 Application (pages 27-28) reproduced below:  
18

19 The role of the selection services interface[s]...is to provide  
20 designers or other editing extensions with the ability to modify the logical  
21 selection state. Consequently, all editing commands and services can  
22 interact with a custom selection model without having detailed knowledge  
23 of the designer that is implementing the selection...The selection services  
24 interface provides methods to programmatically clear, add and remove  
25 segments from a selection object...The interfaces can be utilized by an  
extension that is coupled with the extensible editor to add new features to  
the editor, to augment existing features, or to override the editor's default  
behavior.

1 Simpson, on the other hand, discloses a macro user interface that allows a  
2 user to edit the text of an user created macro. This macro may then be saved to  
3 overwrite the pre-existing macro, thus creating a new macro. Simpson's macro  
4 user interface is simply not the same as, nor is it equivalent to Applicant's recited  
5 selection services interface. Simpson neither discloses nor suggests a selection  
6 services interface as recited in this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this  
7 claim is allowable.

8 For all of these reasons, this claim is allowable.

9  
10 **Claims 2-6** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an  
11 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor  
13 suggested by Simpson.

14 **Claim 23** recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable  
15 instructions for one or more interfaces that, when executed by an extensible  
16 electronic document editor on a computer, perform the following steps:

- 17
- 18 • override a selection function provided by the electronic document editor to  
19 provide a *customized model for the selection function*;
  - 20 • receive parameters from a designer through a *selection services interface*;
  - 21 • utilize the parameters to clear, add or remove a selected segment from a  
22 selection object of an electronic document using the *customized model for*  
23 *the selection function*;
  - 24 • return values to the designer regarding the state of the selected segment.

25 **(emphasis added)**

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that claim 23 is  
2 anticipated by Simpson. The Applicant disagrees.

3 Specifically, the Office alleges that Simpson discloses a customized model  
4 for the selection function and a selection services interface, citing to (pages 512 -  
5 515, 517-518 and 520) of Simpson for support.

6 Simpson discloses processes for creating a macro, describing a macro,  
7 replacing a macro and editing a macro entry. All of which result in a customized  
8 macro. However, the customized macro Simpson discloses is in no way similar to  
9 the recited customized model for the selection function. Simpson neither discloses  
10 nor suggests a customized model for the selection function. Accordingly, for at  
11 least this reason, this claim is allowable.  
12

13 Further, Simpson does not anticipate in any way a selection services  
14 interface as recited in this claim. For at least this additional reason, this claim is  
15 allowable.  
16

17 For all of these reasons, this claim is allowable.

18 **Claims 24-28** depend from claim 23 and are allowable as depending from  
19 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
20 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither shown  
21 nor suggested by Simpson.

22 **Claim 36** recites a method for providing selection services to one or more  
23 extensions in an extensible editor, the method comprising:  
24  
25

- 1       • receiving a request from an extension to utilize a *selection services*  
2       *component*;
- 3       • facilitating the request by presenting a *selection services interface* that is  
4       accessible by the extension and that overrides a selection function provided  
5       by the extensible editor to provide a customized model for the selection  
6       function; and
- 7       • communicating with the extension through the *selection services interface*  
8       to enable the extension to clear, add, or remove a selected segment from a  
9       selection object of an electronic document using the customized model for  
10      the selection function. **(emphasis added)**

11           In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that claim 36 is  
12      anticipated by Simpson. The Applicant disagrees.

13           As discussed with regards to claim 1, Simpson does not anticipate in any  
14      way a selection services component or a selection services interface. Accordingly,  
15      for much the same reasons as discussed with regards to claim 1, Applicant submits  
16      that Simpson does not teach or suggest a selection services component or a  
17      selection services interface. For at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

18           **Claims 37-41** depend from claim 36 and are allowable as depending from  
19      an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
20      features which, in combination with those recited in claim 36, are neither shown  
21      nor suggested by Simpson.

## 22           **Conclusion**

23           All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant  
24      requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next  
25      anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,

1 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an  
2 interview.

3  
4  
5 Dated: 12 Feb 2007

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
Respectfully Submitted,  
By: David Thompson  
David Thompson  
Reg. No. 37954  
(509) 324-9256